UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,811	10/23/2003	Eiji Nogami	24-009-TB	5426
23400 POSZ LAW GF	7590 02/13/200 ROUP, PLC	EXAMINER		
12040 SOUTH	LAKES DRIVE	FISHER, ABIGAIL L		
SUITE 101 RESTON, VA 2	20191		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/690,811	NOGAMI, EIJI	
Examiner	Art Unit	
ABIGAIL FISHER	1616	

	ABIGAIL FISHER	1616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 09 January 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 (periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abai t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07		: FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWC
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL	" " 07.055.44.07	eu	6.11
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in be	nsideration and/or search (see NO¯ow);	ΓE below);	
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a			110 100000 101
NOTE: See Explanation Below. (See 37 CFR 1.1			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10 and 14-21</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	•	, ,,	•
The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	it does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>11</u> /12/08	3	
13. Other: See Continuation Sheet.	. , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
	/Mina Haghighatian/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 1616	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejections are maintained for the reasons provided in the Final Office Action mailed on 9/9/08. Applicants argue that the present invention recite a water swellable gel forming layer that also contain a film forming agent and that the polymers taught by Yamamura are bioadhesive which are excluded by the instant claims. The examiner maintains that the "adhesive layer" taught by Yamamura comprises carboxyvinyl polymer and HPC. Carboxyvinyl polymer is a polymer claimed for the water swellable gel forming agent and HPC is taught in the instant specification as a film forming agent. Polyvinyl alcohol, which is a claimed species for the film forming agent is taught as a functional equivalent of HPC. Therefore, the examiner maintains that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to replace HPC with polyvinyl alcohol as both are taught by Yamamura as functional equivalents. Therefore, it is unclear how these polymers, which are the same as instantly taught and claimed are or can be different. layer, Yamamura teach the layer can comprise ethylcellulose or shellac and HPC. Ethylcellulose is taught as a water swellable gel-forming polymer in the instant specification. As mentioned above HPC is taught in the instant specification as a film forming agent. Therefore, it is unclear how this layer would not be the same as instantly claimed. Note MPEP 2112.02 (11): "Products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties." A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705,709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Therefore, the rejection is maintained as applicants have not demonstrated how their invention is patentably distinct as the both devices comprise the same polymers.

Continuation of 13. Other: The information disclosure statement filed November 11 2008 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.97(c) because it lacks a statement as specified in 37 CFR 1.97(e) and because it lacks the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p). It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.